Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of the drawings include changes to Figure 1. The new Figure 1 replaces the original Figure 1. The amendments to Figure 1 correctly label Figure 1 as prior art in accordance with MPEP § 608.02(g).

Attachment: 1 Replacement Sheet

1 Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

REMARKS

The present Amendment Response is responsive to the Non-Final Office Action mailed
December 8, 2005. By this Amendment, Claims 1, 11, 29 and 35 have been amended.
Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added by this amendment.
Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is requested.

Objections to the Information Disclosure Statement

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the Information Disclosure Statement filed
on January 23, 2004. The Examiner stated that a legible copy of each cited non-patent literature
publication was not included with the Information Disclosure Statement. In particular, the
Examiner stated that the Information Disclosure Statement did not include a copy of the
document entitled Red Brick Systems, Inc., Star Schema Processing for Complex Queries, White
Paper.

In response, Applicants have attached a copy of the relevant non-patent literature
publication to the present Amendment Response.

Objections to the Drawings

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Figure 1 because only that which is old is
illustrated by Figure 1 and a legend such as "prior art" was not used.

In response, Figure 1 has been amended to now include the term "prior art" as a legend.
Both a Replacement Sheet and an Annotated Sheet showing the amendment are attached to the
present Amendment Response. Applicants respectfully submit that Figure 1 is now in proper
form.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

In the Office Action, Claims 1-4, 11-16, 22-24, and 28-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C.
§ 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,757,708 to Craig et al. ("Craig").
Additionally, Claims 5-9, 17, 18, 20, 25-27, 35, 39, and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §
103(a) as being unpatentable over Craig in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,757,726 to Matsumoto et
al. ("Matsumoto"). Finally, Claims 10, 19, 21, 36-38 and 40-42 were rejected as being

11

unpatentable over Craig and Matsumoto in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,128,627 to Mattis et al. ("Mattis"). Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presently amended are allowable over the prior art cited by the Examiner.

A. U.S. Pat. No. 6,757,708 to Craig et al. ("Craig")

Craig is directed to a method for caching dynamically generated content for dynamically generated Web pages. A caching system is used to deliver dynamically generated content to a content requester preferably in response to a JavaServer Page (JSP) request (col. 8, lines 35-55). The JSP may include special JSP tags that execute one or more Java beans. When executed, a Java bean may include the logic to access backend data sources in order to add dynamically generated data to the JSP where it is returned to a browser (column 9, lines 5-40). The Java beans that are produced as a result of a JSP access are then cached (column 10, lines 40-65) and may be retrieved upon future requests for the JSP (column 11, lines 10-35).

B. U.S. Pat. No. 6,757,726 to Matsumoto et al. ("Matsumoto")

Matsumoto is directed to a cache server system that is designed to distribute data amongst various caches without retaining duplicate copies of data. A cache-data-list table stores information concerning the data retained by the various cache servers on an individual basis. Upon receiving a request from one of the cache servers, a cache-data-list-administering unit searches the cache-data-list table for information indicating that one of the other cache servers contains the data requested by the first cache server (column 2, lines 40-65).

C. U.S. Pat. No. 6,128,627 to Mattis et al. ("Mattis")

Mattis is directed to a method for consistently storing cached objects in the presence of failures to ensure atomic object consistency. A cache for information objects includes a directory table that indexes each of the information objects in one of a plurality of buckets and tracks changes associated with the buckets. The integrity of the cache is ensured in the presence of software failures by ensuring that, after a cache restart, all previously cached objects are consistent (column 5, lines 22-36). A pre-failure cached object will either be completely present in the cache or completely absent from the cache upon the cache restart (column 5, lines 22-36).

D. The Claimed Invention is Distinguishable from the Prior Art

The Examiner contends that the JSP taught in Craig corresponds to the "web page template" of the present invention. The Examiner then cites the following passage from Craig for the proposition that Craig teaches a back-end monitor operative to insert a key into the template:

> In this second model, the request **310a** is received by a JSP **355**, which controls the processing of the response without use of a separate servlet. JSP **355** in this example takes use of two beans **365, 366** (although in general a JSP may access any number of beans), each of which may access one or more data stores such as **375, 376**. For each bean, the JSP first sets the bean's input properties, calls its "execute" method and then gets information by accessing the bean's output properties.

The passage cited by the Examiner fails to teach or suggest a "back-end monitor operative to insert a key into the template." The JSP operates <u>without the use of a separate servlet</u> and, therefore, accesses beans on its own. The only structure capable of inserting a java bean, or key, into the JSP is the JSP itself. The JSP cannot be both the back-end monitor and the template. Accordingly, the portion of Craig cited by the Examiner fails to teach or suggest a "back-end monitor operative to insert a key into the template."

Furthermore, Craig fails to disclose at least the claimed recitation that "the template is based upon one or more parameters specific to the user." Although Craig discusses the handling of web page requests, the embodiments described in Craig fail to teach or suggests that a JSP page request may be based upon one or more parameters specific to a user making a web page request. Craig merely states that a request for a JSP is a request for a Web page that is specified using JSP syntax. Accordingly, Craig fails to disclose that "the template is based upon one or more parameters specific to the user."

Moreover, the new limitations that have been added to the independent claims are not disclosed by the other prior art cited by the Examiner. More specifically, neither Matsumoto nor Mattis disclose that "the template is based upon one or more parameters specific to the user."

13

Matsumoto is directed to cache-server system that monitors information contained in several different caches. Matsumoto does not address the issue of a user requesting a web page and, therefore, does not disclose a web page "template based upon one or more parameters specific to the user." Similarly, Mattis, which is directed to a method for consistently storing cached objects in the presence of cache failures, does not address the servicing of web page requests by a user. Accordingly, Mattis does not disclose a web page "template based upon one or more parameters specific to the user."

Furthermore, Claim 35 has been amended to now depend from Claim 29. Applicants respectfully submit that, following the present amendment, Claim 29 is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Claim 35 and each of the claims dependent on Claim 35 are allowable as a matter of law as being dependent on allowable base claims.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that each of the independent claims are allowable. Additionally, each of the dependent claims are allowable as a matter of law as being dependent on allowable base claims, notwithstanding their independent recitation of patentable features.

CONCLUSION

The Applicants believe they have responded to each matter raised by the Examiner. Allowance of the claims is respectfully solicited. It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for addition of claims are required beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR §1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-5029.

Respectfully submitted,

William R. Silverio
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 45,383

SUTHERLAND ASBILL & BRENNAN, LLP
999 Peachtree Street, NE
Atlanta, GA 30309-3996
(404) 853-8214
(404) 853-8806 (fax)
SAB Docket No.: 23952-0075

AO 1495362.1